

PTO Form 1957 (Rev 9/05)

OMB No. 0651-0050 (Exp. 04/2009)

Response to Office Action

The table below presents the data as entered.

Input Field	Entered								
SERIAL NUMBER	78578279								
LAW OFFICE ASSIGNED	LAW OFFICE 105								
MARK SECTION (no change)									
ARGUMENT(S)									
<p>This responds to the Office Action of May 5, 2006.</p> <p><u>Likelihood of Confusion</u></p> <p>The Examining Attorney has refused registration under Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act based on:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reg. No.</th><th>Mark</th><th>Goods/Services</th><th>Owner</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1591868</td><td>ELITE</td><td>audio and video products, namely, amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players - Cl. 9</td><td>Pioneer Kabushiki Kaisha</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the refusal of registration for the following reasons.</p> <p>It is well settled that, in determining likelihood of confusion, the Examining Attorney must look at the marks, in their entirety, for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression. <i>In re E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.</i>, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1973).</p> <p>Looking at Applicant's mark and the cited mark in their entirety, Applicant's mark is distinguishable from the cited mark, as the mark is dissimilar in appearance, sound and connotation, and creates a different commercial impression when compared to the cited mark. Applicant's mark is a compound mark and, as such, both words must be considered as part of the mark. See <i>In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP</i>, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2004); <i>In re Nat'l Data Corp.</i>, 753 F.2d 1056, 1058, 224 USPQ 749 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(stating anti-dissection rule). Clearly the mark ELITEMICRO is visually different from ELITE. Similarly, the mark ELITEMICRO possesses more syllables and is, on the whole, phonetically different from the cited mark. The</p>		Reg. No.	Mark	Goods/Services	Owner	1591868	ELITE	audio and video products, namely, amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players - Cl. 9	Pioneer Kabushiki Kaisha
Reg. No.	Mark	Goods/Services	Owner						
1591868	ELITE	audio and video products, namely, amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players - Cl. 9	Pioneer Kabushiki Kaisha						

marks also have different connotations. ELITE means "the choice part" or "the best of a class." The definition of MICRO is "very small" or "involving minute quantities." While not polar opposites, ELITE and MICRO are somewhat contradictory, as ELITE suggests grandeur and significant size, whereas MICRO means small. By combining the incongruous elements ELITE and MICRO, the overall connotation of Applicant's mark is significantly different from ELITE alone. Unquestionably, the compound mark ELITEMICRO creates a commercial impression dramatically different from ELITE.

There is no *per se* rule that the inclusion of one mark, in its entirety, in another mark automatically results in similarity of appearance, sound, connotation and overall commercial impression. See *Knight Textile Corp. v. Jones Investment Co., Inc.*, 75 USPQ2d 1313 (TTAB 2005) (NORTON MCNAUGHTON ESSENTIALS and ESSENTIALS, both for clothing, found sufficiently distinguishable such that confusion was unlikely to occur); *Kayser-Roth Corporation v. Morris & Company, Inc.*, 164 USPQ 153 (TTAB 1969) (confusion between PAUL JONES ESQUIRE and ESQUIRE, both for men's clothing, unlikely); and *Nast Publications, Inc. v. Miss Quality, Inc.*, 184 USPQ 422 (CCPA 1975) (COUNTRY VOGUES for dresses not likely to be confused with VOGUE for style magazine). In this regard, though ELITEMICRO and ELITE contain a common element, Applicant reiterates that the inclusion of MICRO in ELITEMICRO creates a commercial impression that is significantly different from that of ELITE. See *Shen Manufacturing Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 73 USPQ2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Farm Fresh Catfish Co.*, 231 USPQ 495 (TTAB 1986); *In re Shawnee Milling Co.*, 225 USPQ 747 (TTAB 1985); *In re S.D. Fabrics, Inc.*, 223 USPQ 54 (TTAB 1984).

Customers clearly would not confuse ELITEMICRO with ELITE because of the differences in appearance, sound, connotation and, hence, commercial impression between Applicant's mark and the cited mark.

It is axiomatic that likelihood of confusion must be determined on the basis of the services and goods as they are set forth in the application and cited registration. See e.g., *Paula Payne Products, Co. v. Johnson Publishing Co.*, 177 USPQ 76 (CCPA 1973); *In re Chalet Chocolates, Inc.*, 212 USPQ 968 (TTAB 1982); *Ferdinand Mulhens v. Sir Edward Ltd.*, 214 USPQ 298 (TTAB 1981); *Ziebart International Corp. v. Northern Instruments Corp.*, 212 USPQ 537 (TTAB 1981). Applicant reiterates that the differences between its automated CD and DVD duplicators and the goods identified in the cited registration are such that confusion is not likely.

Confusing similarity between goods or services cannot be presumed merely because the goods represented by the marks fall into the same broad category of electronics. See TMEP 1207.01(a)(iv) (noting that there can be no rule that certain goods or services are *per se* related, such that there must be a likelihood of confusion from the use of similar marks in relation thereto). See also *Mr. Hero Sandwich Systems, Inc. v. Roman Meal Company*, 228 USPQ 364 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (use of ROMANBURGER in connection with sandwiches held unlikely to be confused with ROMAN MEAL for bread and baker's flour); *John L. Armitage & Co. v. National Industries, Inc.*, 166 USPQ 504 (TTAB 1970) (ARMORCLAD for use in connection with finishing paints for, among other items, furniture held unlikely to be confused with ARMORCLAD & Helmet Design for cabinets,

panels, tables, chairs, desks, and other pieces of furniture); and *Season-All Sales Corporation v. Benjamin Moore & Co.*, 134 USPQ 587 (TTAB 1962) (TEMP-GARD for use in connection with mixed aluminum paints unlikely to be confused by purchasers with TEMP-GARD for use in connection with aluminum storm windows and doors).

Applicant's goods, as amended, are automated CD and DVD duplicators "for commercial use". The goods identified in the cited registrations are "amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players". On their face, Applicant's goods and the goods in the cited registration are different, as CD and DVD duplicators are readily distinguishable from stereo and television equipment. Stereo and television equipment is used for entertainment, whereas Applicant's duplicators are completely utilitarian. The duplicators are used in conjunction with a computer to create up to 12 CDs or 9 DVDs per hour; the duplicators place content and print labels (some models) onto the discs. Clearly the cited registrant's home entertainment equipment is sufficiently distinguishable from Applicant's CD and DVD duplicators such that there is no likelihood of confusion between the subject mark and the cited mark.

In addition to the differences between the marks in this application and the cited registration, Applicant submits that additional *du Pont* factors support a finding that there is no likelihood of confusion in this instance. See *In re E.I. du Pont* at 1361 ((1) The similarity or dissimilarity of the marks in their entirety as to appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. (2) The similarity or dissimilarity and nature of the goods ... described in an application or registration or in connection with which a prior mark is in use. (3) The similarity or dissimilarity of established, likely-to-continue trade channels. (4) The conditions under which and buyers to whom sales are made, i.e. "impulse" vs. careful, sophisticated purchasing. (5) The fame of the prior mark ... (6) The number and nature of similar marks in use on similar goods. (7) The nature and extent of any actual confusion. (8) The length of time during and the conditions under which there has been concurrent use without evidence of actual confusion. (9) The variety of goods on which a mark is or is not used ... (10) The market interface between the applicant and the owner of a prior mark. ... (11) The extent to which applicant has a right to exclude others from use of its mark on its goods. (12) The extent of potential confusion. ... (13) Any other established fact probative of the effect of use.)).

In the context of likelihood of confusion analysis, if the evidence establishes that the consuming public is exposed to use of similar marks on similar goods, this evidence "is relevant to show that a mark is relatively weak and entitled to only a narrow scope of protection." *Palm Bay Imports, Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée en 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1373, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Applicant submits that the term ELITE is so commonly used in connection with a wide variety of goods and services that the cited references are weak and entitled to only a limited scope of protection. In this regard, TESS searches of TARR revealed:

1. over 2,050 applications and registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE,

which, in total, cover all of the forty-five international classes;

2. over 1,050 live applications and registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE; and

3. nearly 700 live registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE, including:

Reg. No.	Mark	Goods/Services	Owner
2707992	ELITE ELECTRONICS	tv remote control, stereos, dvd players, cd players, cell phone accessories, namely, cell phone covers, adapters, chargers, earphones, cases, radio headphones, car speakers, radio speakers, computer speakers, stereo speakers, sub-woofers, and tvs - Cl. 9	Boaz Corporation
3152996	ELITE SERIES	Automated CD/DVD duplicators - Cl. 9	Applicant
3141365	ELITEPRO	Automated CD/DVD duplicators - Cl. 9	Applicant
2699315	ELAN ELITE	Audio speakers and audio speaker systems consisting of one or more of the following - amplifiers, radio tuners, compact disc players, audio tape players and video tape players - Cl. 9	Group of companies including Elan Home Systems, LLC
1914674	ELITE	scan converters for use in converting VGA (Video Graphic Arrays) displays to NTSC (National Television System Committee) standard displays for television screens - Cl. 9	ADS Technologies, Inc.

The existence of applications and registrations for ELITE and ELITE-formative marks covering, in total, every international class shows that the consuming public is already exposed to the use of ELITE marks, owned by numerous different entities, and covering a wide array of goods and services. Furthermore, the coexistence of the cited registration with the aforementioned registrations for ELITE marks, including Applicant's ELITE SERIES and ELITEPRO marks, and covering Applicant's goods and audio and video equipment reinforces the narrow scope of protection to which the cited marks are entitled. As evidence of the narrow scope of protection to which the cited mark is entitled, Applicant notes goods common to the cited registration and the aforementioned US Reg. No. 2707992 for ELITE ELECTRONICS:

ELITE	ELITE ELECTRONICS
amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players	tv remote control, stereos, dvd players, cd players, cell phone accessories, namely, cell phone covers, adapters, chargers, earphones, cases, radio headphones, car speakers, radio speakers, computer speakers, stereo speakers, sub-woofers, and tvs

If registrations for ELITE and ELITE ELECTRONICS, covering overlapping goods, can coexist with each other and with Applicant's ELITE SERIES and ELITEPRO registrations covering CD and DVD duplicators, there is no basis for finding a likelihood of confusion between the Applicant's instant application and the cited registration. Clearly, the cited mark is weak and not likely to be confused with the Applicant's composite mark.

Lastly, as an extension of the differences between Applicant's goods and the goods identified in the cited registrations, Applicant submits that its CD and DVD duplicators are "for commercial

use" and are targeted toward those in the business of manufacturing CDs and DVDs. As such, Applicant's goods travel in different likely-to-continue trade channels than the registered goods, which are targeted toward general consumers. Given the different likely-to-continue channels of trade, Applicant's goods and the registered goods would not be encountered by the same purchasers under circumstances that would result in a likelihood of confusion as to the separate sources of the goods. See *Hi-Country Foods Corporation v. Hi Country Beef Jerky*, 4 USPQ2d 1169 (TTAB 1987).

In conclusion, in order to maintain a rejection under Section 2(d) it is not sufficient if confusion is merely "possible." A higher standard is required. See *Shatel Corp. v. Mao Ta Lumber & Yacht Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1352, n.2, 220 USPQ 412 (11th Cir. 1983) (likelihood is synonymous with probability); *Rodeo Collection, Ltd. V. West Seventh*, 812 F.2d 1215, 2 USPQ2d 1204, 1206 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Likelihood of confusion requires that confusion be probable, not simply a possibility."); *Blue Bell Bio-Medical v. Cin-Bad, Inc.*, 864 F.2d 1253, 9 USPQ2d 1870, 1875 (5th Cir. 1989) ("[Plaintiff] must show, however, that confusion is probable; a mere possibility that some customers might mistakenly identify the [defendant's product] as [plaintiff's] product is not sufficient."). This burden has not been met in this case.

Given the foregoing response, it is respectfully requested that Applicant's mark be approved for publication in the *Official Gazette* for opposition purposes.

EVIDENCE SECTION

EVIDENCE FILE NAME(S)	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0002.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0003.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0004.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0005.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0006.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0007.JPG
	\\TICRS\EXPORT2\IMAGEOUT2\785\782\78578279 \xml1\RO A0008.JPG
DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE FILE	dictionary print-out; copies of third-party registrations

GOODS AND/OR SERVICES SECTION (current)

INTERNATIONAL CLASS	009
DESCRIPTION	Automated CD/DVD Duplicators
FILING BASIS	Section 1(a)
FIRST USE ANYWHERE DATE	At least as early as 08/01/2002
FIRST USE IN COMMERCE DATE	At least as early as 08/01/2002
GOODS AND/OR SERVICES SECTION (proposed)	
INTERNATIONAL CLASS	009
DESCRIPTION	Automated CD/DVD Duplicators for commercial use
FILING BASIS	Section 1(a)
FIRST USE ANYWHERE DATE	At least as early as 08/01/2002
FIRST USE IN COMMERCE DATE	At least as early as 08/01/2002
SIGNATURE SECTION	
DECLARATION SIGNATURE	The filing Attorney has elected not to submit the signed declaration, believing no supporting declaration is required under the <i>Trademark Rules of Practice</i> .
RESPONSE SIGNATURE	/rexadonnely/
SIGNATORY NAME	Rex A. Donnelly
SIGNATORY POSITION	Attorneyfor Applicant
SIGNATURE DATE	11/06/2006
FILING INFORMATION SECTION	
SUBMIT DATE	Mon Nov 06 15:26:56 EST 2006
TEAS STAMP	USPTO/ROA-146.145.49.106- 20061106152656052188-7857 8279-340f56f5dd885a164e87 8f5a037fb22fe2-N/A-N/A-20 061106151836426113

PTO Form 1957 (Rev 9/05)

OMB No. 0651-0050 (Exp. 04/2009)

Response to Office Action**To the Commissioner for Trademarks:**

Application serial no. **78578279** has been amended as follows:

Argument(s)

In response to the substantive refusal(s), please note the following:

This responds to the Office Action of May 5, 2006.

Likelihood of Confusion

The Examining Attorney has refused registration under Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act based on:

Reg. No.	Mark	Goods/Services	Owner
1591868	ELITE	audio and video products, namely, amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players - Cl. 9	Pioneer Kabushiki Kaisha

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the refusal of registration for the following reasons.

It is well settled that, in determining likelihood of confusion, the Examining Attorney must look at the marks, in their entireties, for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression. *In re E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1973).

Looking at Applicant's mark and the cited mark in their entireties, Applicant's mark is distinguishable from the cited mark, as the mark is dissimilar in appearance, sound and connotation, and creates a different commercial impression when compared to the cited mark. Applicant's mark is a compound mark and, as such, both words must be considered as part of the mark. See *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1058, 224 USPQ 749 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(stating anti-dissection rule). Clearly the mark ELITEMICRO is visually different from ELITE. Similarly, the mark ELITEMICRO possesses more syllables and is, on the whole, phonetically different from the cited mark. The marks also have different connotations. ELITE means "the choice part" or "the best of a class." The definition of MICRO is "very small" or "involving minute quantities." While not polar opposites, ELITE and MICRO are somewhat contradictory, as ELITE suggests grandeur and significant size, whereas MICRO means small. By combining the incongruous elements ELITE and MICRO, the overall connotation of Applicant's mark is significantly different from ELITE alone. Unquestionably, the compound mark ELITEMICRO creates a commercial impression dramatically different from ELITE.

There is no *per se* rule that the inclusion of one mark, in its entirety, in another mark automatically results in similarity of appearance, sound, connotation and overall commercial impression. See *Knight Textile Corp. v. Jones Investment Co., Inc.*, 75 USPQ2d 1313 (TTAB 2005) (NORTON MCNAUGHTON ESSENTIALS and ESSENTIALS, both for clothing, found sufficiently distinguishable such that confusion was unlikely to occur); *Kayser-Roth Corporation v. Morris & Company, Inc.*, 164 USPQ 153 (TTAB 1969) (confusion between PAUL JONES ESQUIRE and ESQUIRE, both for men's clothing, unlikely); and *Nast Publications, Inc. v. Miss Quality, Inc.*, 184 USPQ 422 (CCPA

1975) (COUNTRY VOGUES for dresses not likely to be confused with VOGUE for style magazine). In this regard, though ELITEMICRO and ELITE contain a common element, Applicant reiterates that the inclusion of MICRO in ELITEMICRO creates a commercial impression that is significantly different from that of ELITE. See *Shen Manufacturing Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 73 USPQ2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Farm Fresh Catfish Co.*, 231 USPQ 495 (TTAB 1986); *In re Shawnee Milling Co.*, 225 USPQ 747 (TTAB 1985); *In re S.D. Fabrics, Inc.*, 223 USPQ 54 (TTAB 1984).

Customers clearly would not confuse ELITEMICRO with ELITE because of the differences in appearance, sound, connotation and, hence, commercial impression between Applicant's mark and the cited mark.

It is axiomatic that likelihood of confusion must be determined on the basis of the services and goods as they are set forth in the application and cited registration. See e.g., *Paula Payne Products, Co. v. Johnson Publishing Co.*, 177 USPQ 76 (CCPA 1973); *In re Chalet Chocolates, Inc.*, 212 USPQ 968 (TTAB 1982); *Ferdinand Mulhens v. Sir Edward Ltd.*, 214 USPQ 298 (TTAB 1981); *Ziebart International Corp. v. Northern Instruments Corp.*, 212 USPQ 537 (TTAB 1981). Applicant reiterates that the differences between its automated CD and DVD duplicators and the goods identified in the cited registration are such that confusion is not likely.

Confusing similarity between goods or services cannot be presumed merely because the goods represented by the marks fall into the same broad category of electronics. See TMEP 1207.01(a)(iv)(noting that there can be no rule that certain goods or services are *per se* related, such that there must be a likelihood of confusion from the use of similar marks in relation thereto). See also *Mr. Hero Sandwich Systems, Inc. v. Roman Meal Company*, 228 USPQ 364 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (use of ROMANBURGER in connection with sandwiches held unlikely to be confused with ROMAN MEAL for bread and baker's flour); *John L. Armitage & Co. v. National Industries, Inc.*, 166 USPQ 504 (TTAB 1970) (ARMORCLAD for use in connection with finishing paints for, among other items, furniture held unlikely to be confused with ARMORCLAD & Helmet Design for cabinets, panels, tables, chairs, desks, and other pieces of furniture); and *Season-All Sales Corporation v. Benjamin Moore & Co.*, 134 USPQ 587 (TTAB 1962) (TEMP-GARD for use in connection with mixed aluminum paints unlikely to be confused by purchasers with TEMP-GARD for use in connection with aluminum storm windows and doors).

Applicant's goods, as amended, are automated CD and DVD duplicators "for commercial use". The goods identified in the cited registrations are "amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players". On their face, Applicant's goods and the goods in the cited registration are different, as CD and DVD duplicators are readily distinguishable from stereo and television equipment. Stereo and television equipment is used for entertainment, whereas Applicant's duplicators are completely utilitarian. The duplicators are used in conjunction with a computer to create up to 12 CDs or 9 DVDs per hour; the duplicators place content and print labels (some models) onto the discs. Clearly the cited registrant's home entertainment equipment is sufficiently distinguishable from Applicant's CD and DVD duplicators such that there is no likelihood of confusion between the subject mark and the cited mark.

In addition to the differences between the marks in this application and the cited registration, Applicant submits that additional *du Pont* factors support a finding that there is no likelihood of confusion in this instance. See *In re E.I. du Pont* at 1361 ((1) The similarity or dissimilarity of the marks in their entireties as to appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. (2) The similarity or dissimilarity and nature of the goods ... described in an application or registration or in connection with which a prior mark is in use. (3) The similarity or dissimilarity of established, likely-to-continue trade channels. (4) The conditions under which and buyers to whom sales are made, i.e. "impulse" vs. careful, sophisticated purchasing. (5) The fame of the prior mark (6) The number and nature of similar marks in use on similar goods. (7) The nature and extent of any actual confusion. (8) The length of time during and the conditions under which there has been concurrent use without evidence of actual confusion. (9) The variety of goods on which a mark is or is not used (10) The market interface between the applicant and the owner of a prior mark. ... (11) The extent to which applicant has a right to exclude others from use of its mark on its goods. (12) The extent of potential confusion. ... (13) Any other established fact probative of the effect of use.).

In the context of likelihood of confusion analysis, if the evidence establishes that the consuming public is exposed to use of similar marks on similar goods, this evidence "is relevant to show that a mark is relatively weak and entitled to only a narrow scope of protection." *Palm Bay Imports, Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée en 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1373, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Applicant submits that the term ELITE is so commonly used in connection with a wide variety of goods and services that the cited references are weak and entitled to only a limited scope of protection. In this regard, TESS searches of TARR revealed:

1. over 2,050 applications and registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE, which, in total, cover all of the forty-five international classes;
2. over 1,050 live applications and registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE; and
3. nearly 700 live registrations for marks comprised of or incorporating ELITE, including:

Reg. No.	Mark	Goods/Services	Owner
2707992	ELITE ELECTRONICS	tv remote control, stereos, dvd players, cd players, cell phone accessories, namely, cell phone covers, adapters, chargers, earphones, cases, radio headphones, car speakers, radio speakers, computer speakers, stereo speakers, sub-woofers, and tvs - Cl. 9	Boaz Corporation
3152996	ELITE SERIES	Automated CD/DVD duplicators - Cl. 9	Applicant
3141365	ELITEPRO	Automated CD/DVD duplicators - Cl. 9	Applicant
2699315	ELAN ELITE	Audio speakers and audio speaker systems consisting of one or more of the following - amplifiers, radio tuners, compact disc players, audio tape players and video tape players - Cl. 9	Group of companies including Elan Home Systems, LLC
1914674	ELITE	scan converters for use in converting VGA (Video Graphic Arrays) displays to NTSC (National Television System Committee) standard displays for television	ADS Technologies, Inc.

	screens - Cl. 9	
--	-----------------	--

The existence of applications and registrations for ELITE and ELITE-formative marks covering, in total, every international class shows that the consuming public is already exposed to the use of ELITE marks, owned by numerous different entities, and covering a wide array of goods and services. Furthermore, the coexistence of the cited registration with the aforementioned registrations for ELITE marks, including Applicant's ELITE SERIES and ELITEPRO marks, and covering Applicant's goods and audio and video equipment reinforces the narrow scope of protection to which the cited marks are entitled. As evidence of the narrow scope of protection to which the cited mark is entitled, Applicant notes goods common to the cited registration and the aforementioned US Reg. No. 2707992 for ELITE ELECTRONICS:

ELITE	ELITE ELECTRONICS
amplifiers; video disc players; compact disc players; combination video disc and compact disc players; monitor televisions; loudspeakers; tuners; and stereo radio/audio cassette players	tv remote control, stereos, dvd players, cd players, cell phone accessories, namely, cell phone covers, adapters, chargers, earphones, cases, radio headphones, car speakers, radio speakers, computer speakers, stereo speakers, sub-woofers, and tvs

If registrations for ELITE and ELITE ELECTRONICS, covering overlapping goods, can coexist with each other and with Applicant's ELITE SERIES and ELITEPRO registrations covering CD and DVD duplicators, there is no basis for finding a likelihood of confusion between the Applicant's instant application and the cited registration. Clearly, the cited mark is weak and not likely to be confused with the Applicant's composite mark.

Lastly, as an extension of the differences between Applicant's goods and the goods identified in the cited registrations, Applicant submits that its CD and DVD duplicators are "for commercial use" and are targeted toward those in the business of manufacturing CDs and DVDs. As such, Applicant's goods travel in different likely-to-continue trade channels than the registered goods, which are targeted toward general consumers. Given the different likely-to-continue channels of trade, Applicant's goods and the registered goods would not be encountered by the same purchasers under circumstances that would result in a likelihood of confusion as to the separate sources of the goods. See *Hi-Country Foods Corporation v. Hi Country Beef Jerky*, 4 USPQ2d 1169 (TTAB 1987).

In conclusion, in order to maintain a rejection under Section 2(d) it is not sufficient if confusion is merely "possible." A higher standard is required. See *Shatel Corp. v. Mao Ta Lumber & Yacht Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1352, n.2, 220 USPQ 412 (11th Cir. 1983) (likelihood is synonymous with probability); *Rodeo Collection, Ltd. V. West Seventh*, 812 F.2d 1215, 2 USPQ2d 1204, 1206 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Likelihood of confusion requires that confusion be probable, not simply a possibility."); *Blue Bell Bio-Medical v. Cin-Bad, Inc.*, 864 F.2d 1253, 9 USPQ2d 1870, 1875 (5th Cir. 1989) ("[Plaintiff] must show, however, that confusion is probable; a mere possibility that some customers might mistakenly identify the [defendant's product] as [plaintiff's] product is not sufficient."). This burden has not been met in this case.

Given the foregoing response, it is respectfully requested that Applicant's mark be approved for

publication in the *Official Gazette* for opposition purposes.

Evidence

Evidence in the nature of dictionary print-out; copies of third-party registrations has been attached.

Evidence-1

Evidence-2

Evidence-3

Evidence-4

Evidence-5

Evidence-6

Evidence-7

Classification and Listing of Goods/Services

Applicant hereby amends the following class of goods/services in the application as follows:

Current: Class 009 for Automated CD/DVD Duplicators

Original Filing Basis: 1(a).

Proposed: Class 009 for Automated CD/DVD Duplicators for commercial use

Declaration Signature

I hereby elect to bypass the submission of a signed declaration, because I believe a declaration is not required by the rules of practice. I understand that the examining attorney could still, upon later review, require a signed declaration.

Response Signature

Signature: /rexadonnely/ Date: 11/06/2006

Signatory's Name: Rex A. Donnelly

Signatory's Position: Attorneyfor Applicant

Serial Number: 78578279

Internet Transmission Date: Mon Nov 06 15:26:56 EST 2006

TEAS Stamp: USPTO/ROA-146.145.49.106-200611061526560

52188-78578279-340f56f5dd885a164e878f5a0

37fb22fe2-N/A-N/A-20061106151836426113



Merriam-Webster OnLine

Merriam-Webster FOR KIDS

Encyclopædia BRITANNICA

Merriam-Webster ONLINE

Merriam-Webster COLLEGIATE®

Merriam-Webster UN

HOME

PREMIUM SERVICES

M-WCollegiate.com
M-WUnabridged.com
Britannica.com
Multi-User Licenses

DOWNLOADS

WORD OF THE DAY

WORD GAMES

SPELLING BEE HIVE

WORD FOR THE WISE

ONLINE STORE

HELP

Merriam-Webster Inc.
Company Information

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

elite

2 entries found for elite.

To select an entry, click on it.

elite
elite[1]



Thesaurus

Merriam-Webster

☒ Dictionary

☐ Thesaurus

Browse by letter

A B C D E F G H I
N O P Q R S T U V

Browse words n

[elite](#)

 elite

Main Entry: elite

Pronunciation: A-'lEt, i-, E-


Function: noun

Etymology: French *élite*, from Old French *eslite*, from feminine of *eslit*, past participle of *eslire* to choose, from Latin *eligere*

1 a *singular or plural in construction* : the choice part : **CREAM** <the elite of the entertainment world> b *singular or plural in construction* : the best of a class <superachievers who dominate the computer elite -- Marilyn Chase> c *singular or plural in construction* : the socially superior part of society <how the elite live -- *A P World*> <how the French-speaking elite...was changing -- *Economist*> d : a group of persons who by virtue of position or education exercise much power or influence <members of the ruling elite> <the intellectual elites of the country> e : a member of such an elite -- usually used in plural <the elites..., pursuing their studies in Europe -- Robert Wernick> **2** : a typewriter type providing 12 characters to the linear inch

- elite adjective

Visit Britannica.com for more information on "elite"Get the [Top 10 Search Results for "elite"](#)
[Pronunciation Symbols](#)



Merriam-Webster OnLine

Merriam-Webster FOR KIDS Encyclopædia BRITANNICA

Merriam-Webster ONLINE Merriam-Webster COLLEGIATE* Merriam-Webster UN

HOME
PREMIUM SERVICES ▼
 M-WCollegiate.com
 M-WUnabridged.com
 Britannica.com
 Multi-User Licenses

DOWNLOADS ◀
WORD OF THE DAY ◀
WORD GAMES ◀
SPELLING BEE HIVE ◀
WORD FOR THE WISE ◀
ONLINE STORE ◀
HELP ◀

Merriam-Webster Inc.
Company Information

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

micro

3 entries found for **micro**.
 To select an entry, click on it.

micro[1,adjective]
 micro[2,noun]
 micr-



Main Entry: **¹mi·cro** 🔊

Pronunciation: 'mI- (") krO

Function: *adjective*

Etymology: *micr-*

1 : very small; *especially* : **MICROSCOPIC**

2 : involving minute quantities or variations

Merriam-Webste

Ⓒ Dictionary

Ⓒ Thesaurus

Thesaurus

Browse by letter

A B C D E F G H I
 N O P Q R S T U V

Browse words n

micro



Visit **Britannica.com** for more information on "micro"

Get the Top 10 Search Results for "micro"

Pronunciation Symbols

Products

Premium Services

Company Info

Contact Us

Advertising Info

Privacy P

© 2006 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36, and 38

Reg. No. 2,707,992

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Registered Apr. 15, 2003

**TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**

ELITE ELECTRONICS

BOAZ CORPORATION (CALIFORNIA CORPORATION)
11772 SORRENTO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 157
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

FIRST USE 9-22-2001; IN COMMERCE 9-25-2001.

FOR: TV REMOTE CONTROL, STEREOS, DVD PLAYERS, CD PLAYERS, CELL PHONE ACCESSORIES, NAMELY, CELL PHONE COVERS, ADAPTERS, CHARGERS, EARPHONES, CASES, RADIO HEADPHONES, CAR SPEAKERS, RADIO SPEAKERS, COMPUTER SPEAKERS, STEREO SPEAKERS, SUB-WOOFERS, AND TVS, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "ELECTRONICS", APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN.

SN 78-048,579, FILED 2-15-2001.

ROBIN CHOSID, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36 and 38

Reg. No. 3,152,996

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Registered Oct. 10, 2006

**TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**

Elite Series

AUDIO & VIDEO LABS, INC./DISC MAKERS
(NEW JERSEY CORPORATION)

7905 N. RTE 130

PENNSAUKEN, NJ 08110

FOR: AUTOMATED CD/DVD DUPLICATORS, IN
CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FIRST USE 8-1-2002; IN COMMERCE 8-1-2002.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHAR-
ACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR
FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE
RIGHT TO USE "SERIES", APART FROM THE
MARK AS SHOWN.

SER. NO. 78-578,422, FILED 3-2-2005.

MATTHEW KLINE, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36 and 38

Reg. No. 3,141,365

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Registered Sep. 12, 2006

**TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**

ElitePro

AUDIO & VIDEO LABS, INC./DISC MAKERS
(NEW JERSEY CORPORATION)
7905 N. RTE 130
PENNSAUKEN, NJ 08110

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHAR-
ACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR
FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

FOR: AUTOMATED CD/DVD DUPLICATORS, IN
CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

SER. NO. 78-578,408, FILED 3-2-2005.

FIRST USE 8-1-2002; IN COMMERCE 8-1-2002.

BRIAN NEVILLE, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36 and 38

Reg. No. 2,699,315

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Registered Mar. 25, 2003

**TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**

ELAN ELITE

ELAN HOME SYSTEMS, LLC (KENTUCKY LLC)
2428 PALUMBO DRIVE
LEXINGTON, KY 40509

AND VIDEO TAPE PLAYERS, IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS.
21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).

FOR: AUDIO SPEAKERS AND AUDIO SPEAKER
SYSTEMS CONSISTING OF ONE OR MORE OF THE
FOLLOWING - AMPLIFIERS, RADIO TUNERS,
COMPACT DISC PLAYERS, AUDIO TAPE PLAYERS

FIRST USE 9-7-1999; IN COMMERCE 9-7-1999.

SER. NO. 76-146,373, FILED 10-5-2000.

LAURIEL DALIER, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

Int. Cl.: 9

Prior U.S. Cls.: 21, 23, 26, 36 and 38

Reg. No. 1,914,674

United States Patent and Trademark Office Registered Aug. 29, 1995

**TRADEMARK
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**

ELITE

ADVANCED DIGITAL SYSTEMS (CALIFOR-
NIA CORPORATION)
20204 STATE ROAD
CERRITOS, CA 90701

FOR: SCAN CONVERTERS FOR USE IN
CONVERTING VGA (VIDEO GRAPHIC
ARRAYS) DISPLAYS TO NTSC (NATIONAL
TELEVISION SYSTEM COMMITTEE) STAND-

ARD DISPLAYS FOR TELEVISION SCREENS,
IN CLASS 9 (U.S. CLS. 21, 23, 26, 36 AND 38).
FIRST USE 10-0-1992; IN COMMERCE
10-0-1992.

SER. NO. 74-538,229, FILED 6-15-1994.

ALAN ATCHISON, EXAMINING ATTORNEY